

animals is as extensive as that of the human mind, and I am at a loss to perceive a difference of kind between them, however much they may differ in degree, and in the manner in which they are expressed. The gradations of the moral faculties among the higher animals and Man are, moreover, so imperceptible, that to deny to the first a certain sense of responsibility and consciousness, would certainly be an exaggeration of the difference between animals and Man. There exists, besides, as much individuality within their respective capabilities among animals as among Man, as every sportsman, or every keeper of menageries, or every farmer and shepherd can testify, who has had a large experience with wild, or tamed, or domesticated animals. This argues strongly in favour of the existence in every animal of an immaterial principle, similar to that which, by its excellence and superior endowments, places Man so much above animals. Yet the principle exists unquestionably, and whether it be called soul, reason, or instinct, it presents, in the whole range of organised beings, a series of phenomena closely linked together, and upon it are based not only the higher manifestations of the mind, but the very permanence of the specific differences which characterise every organ. Most of the arguments of philosophy in favour of the immortality of Man apply equally to the permanency of this principle in other living beings.*

Professor Huxley, when commenting on a passage in Professor Owen's memoir, above cited (p. 481), argues that there is a unity in psychical as in physical plan among animated beings, and adds, that although he cannot go so far as to say that 'the determination of the difference between Homo and Pithecus is the anatomist's difficulty,' yet no impartial judge can doubt that the roots, as it were, of those

* Contributions to the Natural History of the United States of North America, vol. i. part i. pp. 60, 64.